

*REMARKS**Discussion of Claim Amendments*

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite that the surface roughness is measured by a mechanical profile method employing a contact stylus according to the procedure defined in ISO 4288. The claim amendment is supported by the original claims and the disclosure in the originally filed specification, e.g., page 4, lines 8-17. No new matter has been added. The amendment, as well as the following remarks, place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for consideration on Appeal. Accordingly, Applicants request that the amendments are entered.

*Examiner Interview*

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Juan E. Vaughan II for the courtesies extended to Xavier Pillai, one of Applicants' attorneys, during the telephonic interview held on July 10, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner clarified the § 112, second paragraph, rejection by stating that if Applicants provided a copy of the test method ISO 4288, the rejection should be addressed adequately. In addition, the Examiner indicated that in the rejections over Tomita (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0182538 A1), the Examiner equated the monoepoxy compound MCR-E11 to poly(alkylene oxide). The Examiner stated that the monoepoxy compound would polymerize to form poly(alkylene oxide) block.

*The Office Action*

The Office Action sets forth the following grounds for rejection:

(1) claims 1-6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to set forth the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention; and

(2) claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tomita.

*Discussion of Rejections*Section 112, second paragraph rejection

As required by the Examiner during the interview, Applicants enclose herewith a copy of ISO 4288. Also, enclosed is a copy of ISO 4287, which provides additional information on surface roughness parameter Ra. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to specifically recite that the surface roughness Ra is measured according to a mechanical profile method employing a contact stylus. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112, second paragraph, rejection has been fully addressed. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections over Tomita

Applicants respectfully submit that the anticipation and obviousness rejections over Tomita are erroneous. At page 4, lines 1-6 from the bottom of the Office Action, it states that Tomita discloses MCR-E11 as an epoxy type terminal reactive silicon ([0392]). The Office Action acknowledges that the chemical name for MCR-E11 is mono-(2,3-epoxy)propylether terminated polydimethylsiloxane. However, the Office Action contends that MCR-E11 meets the limitations of a graft-polymer of a poly(alkylene oxide) comprising siloxane. During the interview, the Examiner repeated this error. The Examiner contended that the monoepoxy compound would polymerize to form poly(alkylene oxide) blocks. Applicants respectfully submit the contentions are erroneous.

Applicants enclose herewith a copy of the structural formula of MCR-E11. The chemical structure shows clearly that MCR-E11 does not contain a poly(alkylene oxide) block because in the structure only one ether function is present, while “poly” means at least several units. In paragraph [0392] on page 38 of Tomita is described the reaction of MCR-E11 with the cresol-novolac. In this reaction, the epoxy group reacts with the phenolic hydroxyl group of the cresol-novolac, but this reaction is not a polymerization of the epoxy group. It is simply a ring opening of the epoxy group and an addition of the ring opened epoxy group the hydroxyl group of the cresol. So, in this reaction, there is no formation of polyether or poly(alkylene oxide). Accordingly, the rejections, which are based on the

erroneous concept that MCR-E11 meets the limitations of a graft-polymer of a poly(alkylene oxide) comprising siloxane, are erroneous and should be withdrawn.

*Conclusion*

As Applicants believe the application is in proper condition for allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Xavier Pillai, Reg. No. 39,799  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: August 8, 2008